

## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 173 601

CE 022 109

TITLE A Guide for Using Illinois Standards for Quality Agriculture Programs in Community Colleges.  
INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Vocational and Technical Education.  
SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Office of Education, Springfield. Div. of Adult Vocational and Technical Education.  
PUB DATE Mar 79  
NOTE 75p.; For a related document see ED 164 794

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.  
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education Programs; Agricultural Education; Agricultural Engineering; Agricultural Occupations; Agricultural Production; Agricultural Supplies; \*Community Colleges; Equipment Standards; Facility Requirements; Forestry; Horticulture; Postsecondary Education; Program Administration; Program Costs; \*Program Evaluation; \*Program Improvement; Program Length; Program Validation; Secondary Education; Staff Utilization; \*State Standards; Supervised Farm Practice; Teacher Qualifications; \*Vocational Agriculture  
IDENTIFIERS \*Illinois

## ABSTRACT

As a result of a project to prepare standards for agricultural occupations programs in Illinois community colleges, this guide was developed to assist local community college instructors, administrators, and other local persons in the evaluation of local agricultural occupations programs. The first section of the guide explains (1) how standards benefit students, colleges, and the community; (2) how to prepare for a review of the local program; (3) how to conduct the review; and (4) how to develop a plan for upgrading the local program. Section 2 presents a checklist of standards approved by Illinois community college instructors in agriculture. This list is divided into standards which are common to all programs and standards for seven specific areas of the agricultural occupations program. Specific standards are provided for programs in production agriculture, agriculture sales and service, agricultural mechanics, agricultural products, horticulture, forestry, and adult education. The third section of the guide includes field test reports on a community college horticulture program, agricultural supply program, agricultural mechanics program, and agricultural production program. (LRA)

\*\*\*\*\*  
\* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made \*  
\* from the original document. \*  
\*\*\*\*\*

ED173601

A GUIDE FOR USING ILLINOIS STANDARDS FOR QUALITY  
AGRICULTURE PROGRAMS IN COMMUNITY COLLEGES

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION  
Jack Witkowsky, Chairman

ILLINOIS OFFICE OF EDUCATION  
Joseph M. Cronin, Superintendent

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,  
EDUCATION & WELFARE  
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRO-  
DUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM  
THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGIN-  
ATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS  
STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT  
OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF  
EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS  
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Reisinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES  
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education  
Springfield, Illinois  
March, 1979

The Standards for Agricultural Occupations Programs in Illinois  
Community Colleges Project, RD1-B9-106, was developed pursuant to  
a funding agreement with the Illinois Office of Education/Department  
of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education Research and Development  
Section, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777.  
Opinions expressed in this Standards Guide do not reflect, nor should  
they be construed as policy or opinion of the State Board of Education/  
Illinois Office of Education or its staff.

CE 022 109

PROJECT SUMMARY

DAVTE Funding Agreement Number: RD1-B9-106

Official Project Title: Standards for Agricultural Occupations Programs  
in Community Colleges and Metropolitan Schools

Funded Agency: University of Illinois, Urbana Campus  
Department of Vocational and Technical Education

Location: Urbana, Illinois 61801

Time Period Covered: July 1, 1978 - June 30, 1979

Project Staff: Paul Hemp, Project Director

G. Donavon Coil, Principal Investigator

Jerry Nelson, Research Assistant

Charles Rubenacker, Research Assistant

Judy Flewelling, Secretary

Projects Consultants: Larry Fischer, John Wood Community College  
Max Foster, Illinois Central College  
Louis Judson, Joliet Junior College  
Ardell Kimmel, Rend Lake College  
Stan Kosiba, Joliet Junior College  
William Martinie, Illinois Central College  
Bill Rich, Lake Land College  
Timothy Van Hoveln, Lewis & Clark College  
William Hills, Naperville High School  
Mike Scheer, Addison Trails High School

Field Test Coordinators:

Robert Cottingham, Joliet Junior College  
Max Foster, Illinois Central College  
Bill Rich, Lake Land College  
Timothy Van Hoveln, Lewis & Clark College

## ABSTRACT

**TITLE:** Standards for Agricultural Occupations Programs in Illinois  
Community Colleges and Metropolitan High Schools

**PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR(S):** Paul Hemp and G. Donavon Coil

**INSTITUTION:** University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

### OBJECTIVES OF PROJECT:

1. To prepare and publish a validated list of standards for agriculture programs in community colleges and metropolitan schools.
2. To develop an implementation package to be used in program evaluation at the local level.
3. To conduct workshops for teachers, administrators, and advisory council personnel to explain suggested procedures for implementing program standards at the local level.
4. To identify steps to be followed in Phase III of this project.

### PROCEDURES OF IMPLEMENTATION:

1. Organize two steering committees - one to assist with the post-secondary standards and one to assist with the standards for metropolitan programs.
2. Refine and revise standards which were not accepted in Phase I. Identify and validate new standards.
3. Administer "Standards of Quality Form" to teachers to identify additional acceptable standards.
4. Secure formal adoption of additional standards at the IACCAI State Conference in October and at the fall meeting of the MAT organization.
5. Publish a complete list of approved standards.
6. Develop a workshop program package including handouts, audio-visual material and implementation procedures using steering committee members as consultants.
7. Field test implementation package.
8. Conduct six (6) workshops for teachers, administrators, and advisory council representatives.
9. Outline Phase III of the long-term standards project.

### CONTRIBUTION TO VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION:

The development and implementation of appropriate standards in the evaluation of agricultural occupations programs in Illinois will contribute to the development of quality instruction at the local level. These standards, when properly used, will enable educational leaders to identify areas needing improvement and will serve as guidelines for development of new programs. The ultimate result of this effort should be better educational programs for Illinois youth and adults.

### PRODUCTS TO BE DELIVERED:

Twelve copies of the final report and 200 copies of approved standards list will be submitted to DAVTE within 30 days of the close of the budget period. Two-hundred copies of approved standards will be provided for community college personnel.

## SECTION I

This section of the Guide includes the following:

1. Introduction
2. How Standards Benefit Students, Colleges,  
and the Community
3. How to Prepare for a Review of the Local  
Program
4. How to Conduct the Review
5. How to Develop a Plan for Upgrading the  
Local Program

## INTRODUCTION

A preliminary list of standards for high quality vocational programs in agriculture at the secondary and postsecondary level was developed during a national seminar sponsored by the United States Office of Education and held in Kansas City, Missouri in March, 1976. A representative group of secondary and postsecondary instructors, state supervisors and teacher educators in agriculture participated in this seminar as a part of a long-range, national effort to upgrade vocational programs in agricultural occupations. The preliminary list of standards was refined, validated, printed, and disseminated at Iowa State University as a part of a national funded EPDA project. An instructional package designed to assist in the dissemination and implementation of the national standards was prepared and made available to each of the fifty states. The Illinois Joint Staff in Agricultural Education reviewed the standards and the implementation package and recommended that they be revised and adapted to the Illinois situation. A research proposal written by the Agricultural Education Division at the University of Illinois was funded by the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Illinois Office of Education and was implemented in November, 1977 to adapt the national standards or prepare acceptable new standards for agricultural occupations programs in Illinois community colleges.

The dynamic nature of agriculture requires that periodic evaluations of established vocational education programs in agriculture be conducted. New and expanding programs need guides or models to follow to insure their proper development. The Illinois Standards for Quality Agricultural Occupations Programs in Community Colleges will provide some useful criteria for local program evaluation. The primary purpose of this guide is to assist local community college instructors, administrators, and other local persons in the evaluation

of the local program. Locally-directed evaluation efforts should be conducted by a team of professional educators and lay citizens. The results of such evaluations are intended for use in replanning and upgrading vocational agriculture programs and not as a basis for comparing one institution with another or for determining state or federal reimbursement.

A set of suggested general procedures for conducting a local review and evaluation of agriculture programs is included in the following pages of this report. These procedures have been derived from the recommendations set forth in the report of a nationally funded EPDA project conducted at Iowa State University plus valuable suggestions made by a project steering committee composed of ten community college instructors and administrators.

Recognizing that the review procedures to be used at the local level would vary with the situation, the project staff arranged for a field test of the suggested general procedures in four community colleges. The field tests were conducted in January and February, 1979 at Joliet Junior College, Illinois Central College, Lake Land College and Lewis and Clark College. Instructors conducting the field tests were encouraged to use variations in their review procedures so that possible new approaches could be identified and tested. Descriptions of the four field tests are included in Section III of this report.

HOW STANDARDS BENEFIT STUDENTS, COLLEGES AND THE COMMUNITY

The utilization of standards to evaluate and upgrade vocational education programs in agriculture should provide a variety of benefits. These benefits will affect not only students but also colleges, communities, and agricultural industries.

Benefits to Students

- A. Instructional programs designed to meet student interests and needs.
- B. Optimum classroom environment for students and instructors.
- C. Planned and directed supervised internships and cooperative training programs which develop employment skills.
- D. Leadership activities designed to meet student interests and objectives.
- E. Vocational guidance programs that assist the student in making realistic career choices.
- F. Placement and follow-up information.

Benefits to College

- A. Improved student morale.
- B. More efficient use of instructional staff time.
- C. More efficient use of facilities and equipment.
- D. Improved school-community relations.
- E. Better placement and follow-up.
- F. Tool for evaluation of programs.
- G. Recognition of a service provided by the school.

Benefits to Community College Districts

- A. Greater employment among youth.
- B. Youth better prepared to participate in community affairs.
- C. An ongoing supply of qualified employees.
- D. Reduced need for industry sponsored training programs.
- E. Increased awareness of the opportunity in the agricultural education program.
- F. Recognition of importance of agricultural industry.
- G. Development of a greater spirit of cooperation in providing educational opportunities to the community.

HOW TO PREPARE FOR A REVIEW OF THE LOCAL PROGRAM

It is highly desirable that those chosen to evaluate the program have an interest in or responsibility for the agriculture program. With this in mind, the agriculture instructor, department chairperson, or program administrator should proceed with the following steps:

- A. Obtain a complete set of the Illinois Standards for Quality Agricultural Occupations Programs in Community Colleges from the Head State Consultant in Agricultural Occupations. A listing of these standards and a checklist for using them is included in Section II of this report.
- B. Use the program standards that apply to the programs which you are evaluating plus the "Standards Common to All."
- C. Review and discuss standards with the proper authorities in order to proceed in an orderly manner with a review of the local program.
- D. Organize and assemble a Program Review Committee
  1. Select committee members from the following groups:
    - a. Agriculture advisory councils
    - b. Local college administrators
    - c. Agriculture students
    - d. Agriculture alumni
    - e. Agriculture instructor from a neighboring community college
    - f. Parents of agriculture students

- g. Personnel from agricultural businesses  
where students or former students are  
employed.
  - h. High school agriculture teachers
2. Limit the size of the Committee to approximately five members if one program is to be reviewed and seven to ten members if two or more programs are to be reviewed.
  3. If several agriculture programs (horticulture, agricultural supply, agricultural production) are to be evaluated, a review committee should be formed for each program or specialists used in a subcommittee structure.
  4. Orient the committee to its task:
    - a. Purpose of the program review
    - b. Role of the review committee
    - c. Steps in conducting the review
    - d. Role in development of a plan for upgrading the local program(s)
    - e. Role in follow-up evaluation of progress
  5. Provide review committee members with documents and materials which provide them with information needed to make valid judgments.

Examples of materials which may be needed are as follows:

- a. Local one-year and five-year plan
- b. Course outlines
- c. Course catalog
- d. Reports of surveys and follow-up studies

- e. Minutes of advisory council meetings
  - f. Budgets
  - g. Results of evaluations made by external groups
  - h. Program brochures and student handbooks
6. Arrange for resource persons such as administrators, instructional staff, students, and members of state advisory council to be available for interview and consultation.

### HOW TO CONDUCT THE REVIEW

The general procedures for conducting the review are as follows:

- A. Assemble the review committee at the agriculture facility.
- B. Review with the committee the role and function of the agriculture program(s) and the program objectives.
- C. Using the Committee-as-a-Whole, consider each standard in the "Standards Common to All Programs" section and determine whether the local program "Exceeds", "Meets" or "Does not meet" the standard.
- D. For each occupational program, use a subcommittee made up of technical specialists, instructors and administrators to do the rating.
- E. Place a check in the appropriate column of the evaluation scale after a consensus has been reached. (See example)
- F. Write a concise statement in the space marked "observations" citing factors which dictated the committee's decision.
- G. The committee, upon completion of the program evaluation, should proceed to write "Recommendations" for each area of the agricultural program that failed to meet the criteria specified in the corresponding standards. (See example)
- H. Compile a list of all "Recommendations" for improvements that are made as a result of the evaluation and arrange them in order of importance.
- I. Share list of recommendations with the writer of the one-year and five-year plan to see which ones should be written into the college's local vocational plan.

HOW TO DEVELOP A PLAN FOR UPGRADING THE LOCAL PROGRAM

The general procedures for using recommendations to replan the local program are as follows:

- A. Prioritize the list of recommendations using educational considerations, student health, and safety as major criteria (other criteria, e.g., cost, effectiveness, etc. to be determined by the committee.)
- B. Share copies of the prioritized list or complete copies of the program review results with the following groups:
  1. Agricultural advisory council
  2. College board
  3. Administrators not involved in review
  4. Instructors not involved in review
- C. Match resources with needs
  1. After joint consideration between administration and review committee, apply available resources where needed.
  2. In areas where local resources cannot be identified, the following action should be considered:
    - a. Appoint special committees for further study of specific problems.
    - b. Ask support groups to consider specific contributions toward upgrading the local vocational education program in agriculture.

Assistance may be obtained from the following:

- (1) Agriculture Advisory Council
- (2) Young Farmers' Associations
- (3) Parents and Alumni Groups
- (4) Agriculture Industry Sources
- (5) IACCA Boosters' Club

D. File a final report of findings and recommendations with interested groups or agencies and follow dissemination procedures used by college.

1. College board
2. Advisory committee
3. Writer of local one-year and five-year plan

E. Develop a plan for periodic evaluation and follow-up to determine progress made toward upgrading the program.

## SECTION II

This section of the Guide includes the following:

1. Reviewing the Local Programs - an example showing how to use the standards checklist
2. Lists of Standards Approved by Illinois Community College Instructors in Agriculture
  - a. Standards Common to All Programs
  - b. Standards Specific to Production Agriculture
  - c. Standards Specific to Agricultural Supplies and Services
  - d. Standards Specific to Agricultural Mechanics
  - e. Standards Specific to Agricultural Products
  - f. Standards Specific to Horticulture
  - g. Standards Specific to Forestry
  - h. Standards Specific to Adult Education

# REVIEWING THE LOCAL PROGRAMS\*

The following example is provided to help members of the review committee understand their task. The review committee working as a group should place a checkmark (✓) in the appropriate column of the evaluation scale after a consensus has been reached. In addition, observations and recommendations should be recorded in the spaces provided following each standard.

(Example)

| Standard                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                | Exceeds<br>Stand. | Meets<br>Stand. | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |
|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
| <p>The classroom, shops, and laboratory stations are adequate for the number of students enrolled. The equipment replicates that found in the occupations for which training is provided.</p> <p>Observations: Ag. Mech. shop is small and crowded. Need better ventilation system. Equipment and tools for tractor and machinery repair is inadequate.</p> <p>Recommendations: Increase shop size 30%. Install new ventilation system. Increase capital budget for shop equipment \$1000 per year.</p> |                   |                 | ✓                       |
| <p>A land laboratory, convenient to the school, is provided and utilized in the instructional program.</p> <p>Observations: Instructors use farm plots and school gardens for teaching purposes. Land lab is maintained in orderly fashion.</p> <p>Recommendations: None</p>                                                                                                                                                                                                                            | ✓                 |                 |                         |

\* This material was adapted from "A Guide for Implementing Standards for Quality Vocational Programs in Agriculture/Agribusiness Education," Iowa State University, 1977.



5. The instructional program contains the necessary balance of class time, laboratory work, field trips, and occupational experience to adequately prepare students for employment or advanced educational programs.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

6. Students enrolled in vocational education in agricultural occupations are also enrolled in other appropriate courses including science, mathematics, social science, and oral and written communications.

Observations:

Recommendations:

7. The instructional program is articulated with other local secondary, postsecondary, and four-year programs of education in agricultural occupations.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

8. Planned visits are made to prospective employers by the agricultural occupations instructor or school placement officer to determine current manpower needs.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

|                         |
|-------------------------|
| Exceeds<br>Stand.       |
| Meets<br>Stand.         |
| Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |

9. Written courses of study are based on validated competencies and are evaluated and revised annually.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

10. Provisions are made to accomodate students with physical handicaps or other special educational needs.

Observations:

### Recommendations:

11. Community resources, facilities, and industries are identified and utilized to enhance the quality of the instructional program.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

12. Course syllabi are developed that clearly state instructional objectives, activities, and resources to be utilized during instruction.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
|  | Exceeds Stand.       |
|  | Meets Stand.         |
|  | Does Not Meet Stand. |

13. Modern and technically accurate instructional materials and textbooks are utilized in the instructional program.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

14. Students have access to current trade journals and other agricultural publications.

Observations:

### Recommendations:

15. Instruction in safety is provided in advance of any shop or laboratory work.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

### Supervised Occupational Experience

16. A systematic plan is utilized to select, develop, and evaluate training stations that assist students in obtaining desired occupational competencies.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
|  | Exceeds Stand.       |
|  | Meets Stand.         |
|  | Does Not Meet Stand. |

- Observations:**

### Recommendations:

- Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

- Observations:

**Recommendations:**

- Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
|  | Exceeds Stand.       |
|  | Meets Stand.         |
|  | Does Not Meet Stand. |

21. Each instructor responsible for supervision of occupational experience programs maintains adequate records to determine student progress and to assist in placement.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

22. Students receive (school) credit for all supervised occupational employment programs that are conducted during regular school hours.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

23. Students are engaged in supervised occupational experience programs that are related to their occupational objective and are appropriate in light of their ability.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

24. Each student engaged in a supervised occupational experience program maintains accurate and up-to-date records including the competencies acquired during the program.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Exceeds Stand.       |  |
| Meets Stand.         |  |
| Does Not Meet Stand. |  |

## Leadership Development

25. Leadership development activities are an integral part of the instructional program.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

26. All postsecondary agricultural occupations students are encouraged to participate in student organizations.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

## Student Recruitment, Enrollment, and Advisement

27. The agricultural occupations instructor advises each student on a regular basis and assists those with special educational needs to obtain additional assistance from qualified school personnel.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

28. A student file is maintained for all students and contains information on occupational objectives, supervised occupational experience programs, leadership activities, completed course work, and other necessary information.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Exceeds<br>Stand.       |  |
| Meets<br>Stand.         |  |
| Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |  |







41. The instructor is sensitive to the needs of students and can recognize and make provisions for individual student differences within the instructional program.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

42. The instructor is actively involved in professional teacher organizations which are supported by agricultural educators in the state, and is engaged in continuing in-service professional development programs.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

43. The department has access to adequate secretarial services.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

44. When part-time instruction reaches 36 semester hours per year within a given program, an additional full-time instructor will be employed.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
|  | Exceeds<br>Stand.       |
|  | Meets<br>Stand.         |
|  | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |

45. Instructors are employed on contracts to provide for continuous education and supervision of students during summer months.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

### Administration and Supervision

46. The agricultural occupations program is an integral part of the local district plan for vocational education.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

47. Representatives of local, area, and state education agencies participate in planning the program of instruction and are kept informed of the progress made.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

48. In multiple-instructor departments, one instructor is appointed and compensated to serve as department head. Job descriptions are on file for all department staff members.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Exceeds<br>Stand.       |  |
| Meets<br>Stand.         |  |
| Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |  |

49. The advisory council functions under written guidelines which specify the length of a member's term, responsibilities, and operational procedures.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

50. An agricultural occupations advisory council or committee is formed and meets to help determine program needs and to assist in promotion and evaluation of the program.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

|                      |
|----------------------|
| Exceeds Stand.       |
| Meets Stand.         |
| Does Not Meet Stand. |



### Placement

60. The instructor, in cooperation with the school guidance counselor, assists in the placement and follow-up of students. A file of placement and employment records is maintained.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

## Evaluation

61. The instructor, local administrator(s), and appropriate state education agency staff member(s) meet at regular intervals to formally examine and evaluate the agricultural occupations program.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

62. One and five-year follow-up surveys of former students are made to determine their current occupational or educational status.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

63. Results obtained from program evaluations are used to promote, develop, and improve the instructional program.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
|  | Exceeds Stand.       |
|  | Meets Stand.         |
|  | Does Not Meet Stand. |







77. A full-time instructor supervises 16-24 students while they are engaged in an occupational experience program.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

78. Supervised occupational experience involves a range of 8-27 weeks of full-time employment within the two-year program.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

## Student Recruitment, Enrollment, and Counseling

79. Working relationships exist between the agricultural supplies and services faculty and the student services personnel in the school system.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

80. Students are advised concerning the interests, attitudes and physical requirements, and other qualifications essential to successful entry and employment in agricultural supplies and services.

Observations:

### Recommendations:

|                      |  |
|----------------------|--|
| Exceeds Stand.       |  |
| Meets Stand.         |  |
| Does Not Meet Stand. |  |



86. Student/full-time instructor ratio does not exceed 20:1.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

87. Full-time instructors have a B.S. degree in agriculture and have satisfactory employment experiences in the agricultural supply and service area.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

88. Instructors participate in professional improvement activities.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

### Administration and Supervision

89. Periodic reports of activities and accomplishments are submitted.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
|  | Exceeds Stand.       |
|  | Meets Stand.         |
|  | Does Not Meet Stand. |

90. An agricultural supply and service program should have an active advisory council.

Observations:

Recommendations:

| Exceeds<br>Stand. | Meets<br>Stand. | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
|                   |                 |                         |

## STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO AGRICULTURAL MECHANICS

### Supervised Occupational Experience

91. Each student completes a minimum of 450 hours of supervised occupational experience per year in the agricultural mechanics area for which they are being trained.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

### Facilities and Equipment

92. The facilities in agricultural mechanics are designed and used only for agricultural mechanics instruction.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

93. The facilities include a self-contained unit, which houses classrooms, laboratories, offices, storage, and complimentary auxiliary features.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

94. Adequate student lockers, restrooms and clean-up facilities are provided.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
|  | Exceeds<br>Stand.       |
|  | Meets<br>Stand.         |
|  | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |

95. Main entrance to the agricultural mechanics laboratory is a minimum of 14 feet high and 16 feet wide.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

96. Adequate lighting and ventilation are provided.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

97. The classroom has a minimum width of 28 feet and provides 40 square feet of space per student (maximum 32 students) and 120 square feet of storage space.

Observations:

### Recommendations:

98. Adequate space is provided for a library, lockers, and outside storage.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
|  | Exceeds<br>Stand.       |
|  | Meets<br>Stand.         |
|  | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |









122. The maximum number of students for a full-time equivalent teaching load to supervise students on placement is 24 on a semester basis.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

123. Postsecondary instructors are identified as teaching area specialists.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
|  | Exceeds Stand.       |
|  | Meets Stand.         |
|  | Does Not Meet Stand. |

## STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS

## Instructional Program

124. The program of study is based upon approved agricultural products curriculum guides adapted to meet the needs of enrolled students.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

125. Students are engaged in related supervised occupational experience beyond normal classroom and laboratory instruction. They receive experience and credit when placed for occupational experience, or participate in school-provided facilities.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

126. The instructional program excluding Supervised Occupational Experience allocates 25-45% to laboratory activities and experiences.

Observations:

**Recommendations:**

|  |                      |
|--|----------------------|
|  | Exceeds Stand.       |
|  | Meets Stand.         |
|  | Does Not Meet Stand. |



|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
|  | Exceeds<br>Stand.       |
|  | Meets<br>Stand.         |
|  | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |

131. The classroom and laboratory are orderly and attractive, and provide students an example of good industry housekeeping.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

132. Adequate, modern laboratory equipment will be provided to meet instructional needs.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

### Staffing

133. Student/full-time instructor ratio does not exceed 20:1

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

134. Full-time instructors have a B.S. degree in agriculture and have satisfactory employment experience in the Ag. Products area.

Observations:

### Recommendations:

135. An agricultural products program shall have an active advisory council.

|                         |  |
|-------------------------|--|
| Exceeds<br>Stand.       |  |
| Meets<br>Stand.         |  |
| Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |  |

## STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO HORTICULTURE

## Instructional Programs

136. Community resources, facilities, and industry have been identified and are utilized in an attempt to enrich the learning experience of the students.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

137. A minimum of 1,000 hours are devoted to postsecondary instruction and laboratory and cooperative on-the-job experience.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

138. The complete program in horticulture includes technical horticulture, horticultural mechanics, supervised occupational experience, laboratory experience, leadership training, and occupational guidance. Technical horticulture includes flower shop management, greenhouse management, turf management, garden center management, arboriculture, nursery management, including construction, installation, maintenance, design, park management, vegetable production, fruit science (pomology), and apiculture.

## Leadership Development

139. The instructors of the ornamental horticulture program also serve as advisors to the vocational student organization that provides leadership training for students enrolled in the program.

Observations:

### Recommendations:

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
|  | Exceeds<br>Stand.       |
|  | Meets<br>Stand.         |
|  | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |

### Facilities and Equipment

(140-146) The following horticulture facilities, conforming to state standards, are available for use in the specialized instructional programs:

140. Head house and work area (600 sq. ft. total)
141. Walk-in cooler
142. Storage area
143. Classroom
144. Instructor's office
145. Horticulture mechanics laboratory
146. Restrooms, shower, and locker rooms

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

147. Equipment is commensurate with state horticultural industry standards and instructional objectives.

**Observations:**

### Recommendations:

148. An adequate ornamental horticulture library is maintained and kept current.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
|  | Exceeds<br>Stand.       |
|  | Meets<br>Stand.         |
|  | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |

| Exceeds<br>Stand. | Meets<br>Stand. | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
|                   |                 |                         |

149. The following ornamental horticulture facilities, conforming to state standards, are available for use in the specialized instructional program:

A minimum greenhouse of 1800 sq. ft. is necessary for horticulture programs using greenhouse space. Seventy sq. ft. per FTE student is recommended.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Staffing

150. Twenty regular students, or 10 special needs students represent the maximum enrollment in classroom/laboratory classes.

Observations:

Recommendations:

|  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
|  | Exceeds<br>Stand.       |
|  | Meets<br>Stand.         |
|  | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |

- (151-153) Time and finances are provided for instructors to upgrade their professional and technical skills through:

151. five annual visits to other ornamental horticulture departments, or to trade/technical conferences.
152. attendance at state technical education or state education agency conferences
153. subscriptions to journals in each area of specialization.

**Observations:**

**Recommendations:**

154. Horticulture instructors must meet minimum education certification and have twenty (20) semester hours in horticulture and/or one and one-half (1½) years of related work experience.

Observations:

### Recommendations:

STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO FORESTRY

Instructional Program

155. The program provides for 800 contact hours of instruction in forestry courses, two-thirds of which are devoted to field instruction.

Observations:

Recommendations:

- 156-162) The 800 contact hours of instruction are distributed among subject matter areas in approximately the following manner:

| <u>Contact Hours</u> |     | <u>Subject Matter</u>                    |
|----------------------|-----|------------------------------------------|
| 156.                 | 110 | Land Surveying                           |
| 157.                 | 20  | Woods Safety                             |
| 158.                 | 30  | Forestry Equipment                       |
| 159.                 | 110 | Harvesting Techniques<br>and Utilization |
| 160.                 | 50  | Forest Land Use and Development          |
| 161.                 | 50  | Forest Management Practices              |
| 162.                 | 20  | Firemanship                              |

Observations:

Recommendations:

| Exceeds<br>Stand. | Meets<br>Stand. | Does Not<br>Meet S-and. |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
|                   |                 |                         |

Student Recruitment, Enrollment, and Advisement

163. Students in postsecondary programs have high school diplomas or the equivalent.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Facilities and Equipment

164. A sufficient outdoor laboratory or school forest is to be provided. The location should be readily accessible to students during regular class time.

Observations:

Recommendations:

(165-166)An agricultural mechanics laboratory is provided which:

165. meets the minimum standards for space utilized for furnishings, equipment and instruction
166. allows for maintenance and storage of tools and equipment of the type simulating that used in the forestry industry.

Observations:

Recommendations:

| Exceeds<br>Stand | Meets<br>Stand. | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
|                  |                 |                         |

STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO ADULT EDUCATION

167. Agricultural programs will include adult education as an integral part of the existing programs as defined by the Illinois Community College Act.

Observations:

Recommendations:

| Exceeds<br>Stand. | Meets<br>Stand. | Does Not<br>Meet Stand. |
|-------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|
|                   |                 |                         |

### SECTION III

This section of the Guide includes the following field test reports:

1. Horticulture program - Joliet Junior College
2. Agricultural Supply Program - Illinois Central College
3. Agricultural Mechanics Program - Lake Land College
4. Agricultural Production Program - Lewis & Clark College

## RESULTS OF FIELD TESTS CONDUCTED AT FOUR ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The research project staff prepared a set of suggested general procedures for community colleges to follow in conducting local program evaluations. This set of procedures was considered to be a tentative approach to the use of the program standards since it had not been subjected to field testing at the local level. The project steering committee recommended that field testing of the suggested procedures be carried out and that the instructors in charge of the field tests be encouraged to explore alternative procedures and to test out variations which were believed to have merit. Four agriculture instructors agreed to conduct field tests as follows:

Robert Cottingham - Joliet Junior College - Horticulture

Max Foster - Illinois Central College - Agricultural Supplies

Bill Rich - Lake Land College - Agricultural Mechanics

Tim Van Hoveln - Lewis & Clark College - Agricultural Production

Each instructor was to conduct a local program review using a review committee and the standards pertaining to the program assigned and the standards designated as "Common to All Programs." The instructors engaged in the field testing exercises were asked to present oral reports at the regional workshops conducted for Illinois community college agricultural instructors and to prepare a short written report of their field test activities. The four field test reports are included in this section of the guide.

Community college personnel who plan to conduct local program reviews are urged to take advantage of what has been learned in the field test sites in designing their own review process. Using the set of general procedures in Section I of this report and the results of the field tests, instructors and administrators should be able to fashion a plan which will be appropriate for the local situation.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STANDARDS PROJECT  
FIELD TEST REPORT

Area I--Joliet Junior College  
Pilot Teacher--Robert Cottingham  
Standards Tested--Standards Common to all Programs  
Horticulture

The quality standards for agriculture programs approved by the Illinois Association of Community College Agriculture Instructors were used by two separate groups at Joliet Junior College to evaluate the horticulture program. The first evaluation was done by a "local" group on January 4, 1979; the second evaluation by a team of educational professionals who came to Joliet on January 8, 1979.

The local team was made up of two members of the Joliet Junior College Horticulture Advisory Council, the Department Chairman of the Biology Department at Joliet Junior College, and the Agriculture Business Program Coordinator at Joliet. One of the advisory council members has served on the council since the beginning of the horticulture program and is the co-owner and operator of a greenhouse-flower shop. The other advisory council member had been on the council for three years, is a former student from Joliet Junior College, and is superintendent of a golf course. The input from the Biology Department Chairman was quite limited inasmuch as he was involved in another meeting for the majority of the morning. The Agriculture Business Coordinator assumed the role of team leader for the evaluation.

The professional evaluation team was composed of a staff member from the Division of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, the Agriculture Department Chairman of a junior college department that has a horticulture

program, and a horticulture instructor from another junior college in Illinois. The president of the Illinois Association of Community College Agriculture Instructors was consulted on the selection of the three members of the professional evaluation team.

In preparation for both evaluations, a packet was assembled to provide information to the evaluators on the extent to which the program met the "standards common to all programs" and the "standards specific to horticulture programs". Attached is a list of the information presented to the evaluators, indicating the standard, by number, to which the data were to apply. Both teams felt that the information packet was indispensable, and it would be recommended that materials of this type be assembled whenever the quality standards are used for evaluation.

Also in preparation for the evaluations, the following time plan was projected for both evaluations by the pilot teacher.

|       |                                                     |
|-------|-----------------------------------------------------|
| 8:00  | Coffee and conversation                             |
| 8:30  | Evaluation                                          |
| 12:30 | Lunch                                               |
| 1:15  | Complete review-observations<br>and recommendations |
| 2:30  | Meet with staff to present results                  |
| 3:30  | Adjourn                                             |

This, however, was not the way in which either of the evaluations progressed. Perhaps, because of the expertise of the evaluators and their awareness of the situation, the following procedures were used and should be recommended:

- a. Coffee
- b. Tour of the facilities
- c. Evaluation
- d. Lunch
- e. Continued evaluation
- f. Summary meeting with staff

At the beginning of evaluation time, the pilot teacher was involved for approximately one-half hour to initiate and answer questions on the evaluation. It became evident that time beyond this would be counter-productive. From time to time during the evaluation, pilot teacher checked with the evaluators and answered questions on specific standards. In both evaluations, group members worked together on all of the standards rather than assigning specific standards to individuals and then coming back together to formulate observations and recommendations. All observations and recommendations were arrived at by the team as a whole.

In the summary session with the horticulture staff:

Both teams mentioned the following standards: 4, 5, 9, 21, 33, 62, 136. They agreed in their observations on numbers 9, 21, and 62. They disagreed in their observations of numbers 5, and 33. Mentioned only by the local group were standards numbered 11, 14, 16, 17, 32, 40, 43, 45, 50, 51-58, 137, 139, 149, and 154. Mentioned only by the professional educators were standards numbered 10, 15, 48, 140-146.

On the written report, the local evaluation group made specific recommendations on eighteen of the 72 standards. The professional educators made specific recommendations on 12 of the 72 standards. Recommendations were made by both evaluation teams on standards numbered 4, 5, and 62. In addition, the local evaluators commented on standard number 167 concerning adult education.

The results of both of these program surveys were used with a Horticulture Advisory Council meeting held at Joliet on January 10, 1979. Consideration of the evaluation results lead to specific recommendations being made by the advisory council, and to changes in the one-and five-year plan for the horticulture program.

Following the summary session with staff, the usefulness of the standards in evaluating programs was discussed with both groups of evaluators. The local group suggested that standard number 9 be made to read "evaluated and/or revised annually," feeling that annual revision of course outlines might not be necessary or productive. A similar concern was brought out by the professional educators.

The local group suggested that perhaps there should be standards concerning retention of students and the recruitment of students.

The team of professional educators made the following comments on standards:

- No. 7 - Some explanation of the system of "articulation" may be needed.
- No. 25 - The use of the word "integral" was questioned. It was suggested that the word "instructional" be removed from the standard.
- No. 25 &  
26 - The measurability of these standards was questioned, and this promoted a discussion on the measurability of all of the standards.
- No. 148 - The word "adequate" needs definition.

It appeared that the disagreement on Standard Number 5 resulted from the fact that the professional educators looked at individual courses in making their recommendation, while the local team based their recommendation on the timing of the on-job-training periods. The differences in comments and recommendations on Standard Number 33 resulted from the concern of the professional group for the needs of the handicapped.

Recommendations of the pilot teacher:

The standards would be used frequently by local groups to provide input to the advisory council for program improvement.

The programs should be evaluated periodically by a professional group sanctioned by the professional association of the community college agriculture teachers.

The results of the local evaluation and professional evaluations should be used to update the one-and five-year plans for specific programs and departments.

Comments about the standards should be forwarded to appropriate Statewide Advisory Councils and/or the Executive committee of the Illinois Association of Community College Agriculture Instructors, and specific recommendations should be acted upon by the Association membership.

Evaluations of this size should not require more than one day to complete.

The numbers of members of the team should be kept at a minimum in order to facilitate completion of the evaluation in a minimum amount of time; however, in order to achieve quality of evaluation, representation of various agencies, backgrounds, experience, and points of view of team members should outweigh time and group size limitations.

| <u>STD</u><br><u>#</u> | <u>Item</u>                                                    |
|------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1                      | One- and Five- Year Plan                                       |
| 2                      | Philosophy for Vocational Education in Agriculture-See Catalog |
| 3                      | Advisory Council minutes                                       |
| 4                      |                                                                |
| 5                      | Program Brochures                                              |
| 6                      |                                                                |
| 7                      | Articulated Courses IACCAI - Capston Information               |
| 8                      |                                                                |
| 9                      | Course Outlines                                                |
| 10                     |                                                                |
| 11                     | List of Field trips & Training Stations List                   |
| 12                     | (see item 9)                                                   |
| 13                     | Text Book List - Publications List                             |
| 14                     | List of Publications Received                                  |
| 15                     |                                                                |
| 16                     | "Employer Files"                                               |
| 17                     | Training Agreements                                            |
| 18                     |                                                                |
| 19                     |                                                                |
| 20                     | O-J-T Project                                                  |
| 21                     | Weekly O-J-T reports                                           |
| 22                     |                                                                |
| 23                     |                                                                |
| 24                     |                                                                |
| 25                     | SAA & SHA                                                      |
| 26                     |                                                                |
| 27                     |                                                                |
| 28                     | Example Advisee File                                           |
| 29                     | Open House program                                             |
| 30                     |                                                                |
| 31                     |                                                                |
| 32                     |                                                                |
| 33                     |                                                                |
| 34                     |                                                                |
| 35                     |                                                                |
| 36                     |                                                                |
| 37                     |                                                                |
| 38                     |                                                                |
| 39                     | Inventory (Bob Glenn's office)                                 |
| 40                     |                                                                |
| 41                     |                                                                |
| 42                     |                                                                |
| 43                     |                                                                |
| 44                     | Instructor Loads                                               |

| <u>STD</u><br><u>#</u> | <u>Item</u>                             |
|------------------------|-----------------------------------------|
| 45                     |                                         |
| 46                     |                                         |
| 47                     |                                         |
| 48                     |                                         |
| 49                     | Advisory Council Handbook               |
| 50                     |                                         |
| 51-59                  | Budget                                  |
| 60                     | Student Summaries                       |
| 61                     |                                         |
| 62                     | (see #60)                               |
| 63                     | (see #3)                                |
| 136                    |                                         |
| 137                    | Program Brochure                        |
| 138                    | (see #137)                              |
| 139                    |                                         |
| 140-146                |                                         |
| 147                    |                                         |
| 148                    |                                         |
| 149                    |                                         |
| 150                    | Fall & Spring Schedules                 |
| 151-153                | Budget & Summary of Instructor Meetings |
| 154                    |                                         |

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STANDARDS PROJECT  
FIELD TEST REPORT

Area II--Illinois Central College  
Pilot Teacher--Max Foster  
Standards Tested--Standards Common to all Programs  
Agricultural Supplies and Services

Committee Make-up:

1. Professional from another junior college
2. Cooperator in SOE
3. Businessman
4. Former student
5. Consultant
6. Local staff member

Agenda for the Days Activities:

- 8:30- 9:00 Introductions, objectives
- 9:00- 9:30 Tour of facilities including Learning Resources Center
- 9:30-10:00 Presentation of support materials
- 10:00-11:30 Standards evaluation
- 11:30-12:30 Lunch and free time
- 12:30- 2:30 Standards evaluation and recommendations\*
- 2:30- 3:00 Report to the staff

\*Recommendations should be formulated as the committee proceeds through the standards.

Listing of Support Materials:

1. Course syllabus
2. Advisory council minutes
3. Placement materials, ie: training agreement, report outline, weekly reports, training plans, evaluations instruments.
4. Course outlines
5. Course objective and/or competencies

6. Follow-up students 1 and 5 year
7. Student records or an outline of our system
8. Catalog copy and program brochures
9. List of textbook and reference materials
10. Departmental budgets
11. Copies of 1 and 5 year plan
12. Copy of student reports on placement
13. Copy of the evaluation instrument used

Observations on procedures:

1. Would be beneficial to have a current student on committee.
2. Committee members had a problem with what to compare with (no Standard available).
3. Committee indicated a faculty member in an other area could be helpful.
4. A list of questions to use when interviewing students would be helpful. (See Standard 13, 14, & 15.)
5. Prepare a list of items that should be checked on the tour, ie: lab equipment, references in the library, periodicals.
6. Visit with a librarian.
7. Go through the material for a period of time and then take tour.
8. Send out support materials ahead of time.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STANDARDS PROJECT  
FIELD TEST REPORT

Area III--Lake Land College  
Pilot Teachers--Bill Rich and Tom Reedy  
Standards Tested--Standards Common to all Programs  
Agriculture Mechanics

Lake Land College located at Mattoon, Illinois was selected as a site to field test standards for Agriculture Mechanics. The local program review was conducted during January and February 1979.

Local Program Review Procedure

1. The Agriculture staff at Lake Land College met as a staff to review the checklist. Assignments were given to collect data as required by the review form. Example: entrance door height and width, square feet in the classroom, class size.
2. The Local Program Review was placed on the agenda for the January 1979 Agriculture Mechanics Advisory Council meeting. The purpose of the Illinois Standards project was reviewed by the council and a plan of action developed.
3. A local program review committee was selected by the council to review the standards relevant to the Agriculture Mechanics Program at Lake Land College and to complete the checklist.
4. The review committee met for an afternoon on campus to view the facilities and complete the check list.
5. The review committee will be on the agenda at the next Agriculture Mechanics Advisory Council meeting to report on committee findings.
6. Following acceptance of the report by the Agriculture Mechanics Advisory Council it will be forwarded to the appropriate college administrator with recommendations in areas that are deficient.

Review Committee Make-Up

Bud Overbeck, Lake Land College Mechanics Instructor

Tom Reedy, Chairman of Agriculture Division at Lake Land College

Dwight Schilling, owner of Schilling John Deere Dealership and training station cooperator.

Bob Corley, owner of Corley International Harvester Dealership and training station cooperator.

Bruce Elliott, Agriculture Mechanics student at Lake Land College

Dale Puyear, Agriculture Mechanics student at Lake Land College

Ed Dunphy, Instructor at Lake Land College in Agriculture Business

Supportive Materials

-College catalog

-Division budget

-One-and five-year plan

-Course syllabus

-Training agreement

-Placement data

-Enrollment data

-Staff qualifications

Observations of Review Committee:

1. The local review process is beneficial to help keep programs relevant and meaningful.
2. Local program review is an excellent public relations vehicle to secure community involvement.
3. The checklist seems appropriate as a basis for program review.
4. Staff members and others engaged in the review process must be realistic and realize that some changes needed may never come about

or at least be slow in coming because of budget, attitudes, or other reasons.

5. Colleges should use local people for program review but keep in mind the Agriculture Mechanics program in the Community College should be a leader in the field and not always playing "catch-up".

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STANDARDS PROJECT  
FIELD TEST REPORT

Area IV--Lewis and Clark Community College  
Pilot Teacher--Timothy Van Hoveln  
Standards Tested--Standards Common to All Programs  
Agricultural Production

The Agricultural Science Department field tested the approved Standards for Quality Education utilizing the recommended checklist instrument and suggested procedures on February 5, 1979. A total of two and one-half hours was spent on this exercise.

The Evaluation Team

The evaluation team consisted of individuals from the Lewis and Clark district and were knowledgeable of the college and/or agriculture program. Potential members were contacted individually and given a brief explanation of the exercise. Those individuals accepting the invitation to participate were:

- a. Dr. Peter Chacharonis - Chairman of the Health & Life Sciences Division, Lewis and Clark Community College. The Agricultural Science Department is part of this Division.
- b. Dr. Albert K. Van Walleghen, D.V.M. - Veterinarian and past-President of the Lewis and Clark Board of Trustees. He has been a trustee since the conception of the College.
- c. Mr. James Seibert - Chairman of the Lewis and Clark Agricultural Advisory Committee. He also is an agricultural loan officer for Jersey State Bank.
- d. Mr. Michael Weber - a 1975 graduate of the Agricultural Science program at Lewis and Clark. He presently is employed as an insurance agent for Country Companies.

Each member was provided with the instrument for the evaluation and given explicit instructions. The following three questions were emphasized:

- a. Does the instrument provide sufficient opportunity to evaluate the program? Will it provide ample information to the institution involved?

- b. What individuals should serve on the evaluation team?
- c. What sources of information should be provided to the evaluation team for standard clarification? Who? What? When?

The following observations and recommendations were made during this exercise:

#### The Instrument

##### General Observations:

"Some standards are "canned" questions in many areas, not only on physical facilities."

"Had trouble with some terminology, but after discussing them, they became relevant."

"The team should (must) have access to instrument prior to any formal meeting."

"Some redundancy in questions."

"How can one exceed state-federal mandates or laws? Like in Number 1, 10, 18, 34, and 46?"

"Idea of observations and recommendations is good. Most evaluations are set up this way."

"In Number 36, what is a proper arrangement?"

##### Recommendation:

In a total perspective, the instrument works. It provides adequate opportunity to evaluate the program.

#### The Evaluation Team

##### General Observations:

"I think you did a good job in selection. You have a faculty perspective, division perspective, advisory perspective, a board perspective, and a student perspective."

"This group provides variety. All of us have different ideas on various aspects of the program."

"Outsiders? Definitely not! If I didn't know anything about the program and were asked to evaluate it, I'd be lost. I'd feel out of place."

"The student perspective should be a past graduate. At least two years out of school or more."

"You might have included a S.O.E. coordinator or trainer. many questions pertained to this area."

"I think a S.O.E. coordinator would have been very beneficial."

"A high School Ag. teacher may fit in. Especially in the areas of articulation and public relations."

Recommendation:

The evaluation team should include perspectives from the following:

- a. Agriculture faculty
- b. Division Chairman
- c. Advisory Committee
- d. Student (graduate)
- e. Board
- f. S.O.E. Trainer
- g. High School Ag. teacher

Sources of Information

General Observations:

None

Recommendations:

1. Student evaluations of courses and programs.
2. Student files, especially S.O.E.
3. One- and five-year follow-up surveys of graduates.
4. Tour of facilities.
5. Departmental budget.
6. Audit sheets of monthly dispersements.
7. One- and five-year plans.
8. R.A.M.P. document.
9. Faculty member in agriculture.

The State Board of Education/Illinois Office of Education insures equal employment/educational opportunities/affirmative action regardless of race, sex, color, national origin, religion, age or handicap.